Agency	Project	FY2005-06	FY2006-07
Supreme Court	Acquire Juvenile Case Management System	\$ 992,737.00	\$ 342,737.00

SUMMARY OF REQUEST (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

A review of Juvenile case processing by the Supreme Court's Court Improvement Project (CIP) Coordinator resulted in recommendations to better monitor individual case processes, overall court processing times, and better track individuals. The State Court Administrator decided to acquire and install a separate juvenile case management system for the use of the three Separate Juvenile Courts and possibly for the county courts which sit as juvenile courts. This decision was made to avoid development efforts needed to provide this functionality and so the system can be delivered quickly.

FUNDING SUMMARY

	Estimated Prior Expended	F	Y2005-06 (Year 1)		FY2006-07 (Year 2)		FY2007-08 (Year 3)		FY2008-09 (Year 4)	Total
1. Personnel Costs		\$	137,737.00	\$	137,737.00	\$	137,737.00	\$	137,737.00	\$ 550,948.00
7. Other Operating Costs		\$	75,000.00	\$	100,000.00	\$	100,000.00	\$	100,000.00	\$ 375,000.00
8. Capital Expenditures										
8.1 Hardware		\$	30,000.00	\$	30,000.00	\$	30,000.00	\$	30,000.00	\$ 120,000.00
8.2 Software		\$	750,000.00	\$	75,000.00	\$	75,000.00	\$	75,000.00	\$ 975,000.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$ -	\$	992,737.00	\$	342,737.00	\$	342,737.00	\$	342,737.00	\$ 2,020,948.00

PROJECT SCORE

Section	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	11	12	4	9.0	15
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	15	20	9	14.7	25
V: Technical Impact	14	13	0	9.0	20
IV: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	5	7	4	5.3	10
VII: Risk Assessment	6	9	4	6.3	10
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	10	10	7	9.0	20
	<u> </u>		TOTAL	53	100

REVIEWER COMMENTS

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
III: Goals, Objectives, and Projected Outcomes	The section on goals and objectives provides a detailed list of requirements. Project proposal seeks to improve juvenile court case monitoring by the courts. This would promote the court's oversight of juveniles involved in abuse and neglect cases. There are direct recommendations for some functionality from ASFA but that does not necessarily transfer to specifications.	- The Agency IT plan presents two projects relating to juvenile case processing. One is to acquire a separate system to serve the juvenile courts. The other is the modification of JUSTICE. It is not clear how these two options will be evaluated. What criteria will be used to choose between the two options? - The project cites the Supreme Court's Court Improvement Project, and specifies court compliance with the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) as justification for the request. However, federal and state law mandates that compliance with ASFA requirements as specified in the Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) is the sole function of the Department of Health and Human Services. ASFA

Project #05-02 Page 2 of 3

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
		does not mandate court processing requirements. The goals and objectives specified in this section are SACWIS requirements currently under development by the Department of Health and Human Services. Their development by the courts would be duplicative, and could not be submitted to the federal government as evidence of compliance. As the federal and state ASFA agency, only HHSS can report to the federal government, and federal compliance reviews will be of the HHSS system. The burden of compliance and potential loss of funding does not fall on the court. - No discussion of examining options. Replacement of JUSTICE outside of counties without separate juvenile courts unclear.
IV: Project Justification / Business Case	- Improvement in the court's case juvenile processing system will allow better management of juvenile cases. The project recommends "a needs analysisto identify system enhancements that are needed/desired by the larger court systemwithin the state's unified court system." The CIP report listed three options as detailed in the proposal. These options should be pursued prior to the purchase of a software system.	The primary justification appears to be compliance with the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act. What is the deadline for complying, and how will the federal government enforce this mandate? Do any metrics exist that illustrate the extent and severity of problems in Nebraska? The CIP consultants presented three options for further evaluation. That evaluation is essential to developing the business case. While noting the need for a comprehensive study, this proposal appears to acquire a system first, and then determine court needs. Within the proposal, there is no discussion of how the new juvenile system would integrate with the 90 county courts sitting as juvenile courts that currently use JUSTICE as the case management system. Even assuming that the court would meet the ASFA requirements, there is no discussion on how the court would report their results to HHSS for subsequent reporting to the federal government. The long term assessment seems key to the recommendations but it is not clear if it will be included int his project.
V: Technical Impact	- Relies on consultant's recommendations (assuming they are solid) while acknowledging many unknowns.	- The project will impact JUSTICE and the interfaces with major systems in other agencies. The magnitude of the impact, including costs, should be evaluated before choosing a solution. - This section does not describe a technical impact, and only references "Web-based system" technology. - Why web-based? (no evaluation of other options in IV) An RFI would have provided a lot of information on feasibility and options as well as the information requested in #7. Detailed specifications & requirements needed. HHSS may have a lot of that data.
VI: Preliminary Plan for Implementation	The proposal describes a supreme court effort to identify juvenile court requirements. Commercial acquisition can address many support issues. Committee review will allow for broad input but an RFP is time consuming.	Information regarding milestones, deliverables, training, and ongoing support are not known. Absent a comprehensive plan for juvenile courts, the project fails to detail an implementation plan. Rather, the plan seeks to acquire a new system but lacks detail on the functions that the system must provide. Specification development processes, product reviews (RFI, vendor queries, etc) and interface specifications should be discussed at length. While commercial application can ease many aspects there is a lot of up front work required.
VII: Risk Assessment	The proposal correctly lists risk factors and potential complications for the courts unified court system.	Some of the requirements of the new system, such as tracking relationships among individuals are similar to functionality in the N-FOCUS system

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION

Project Proposal - Summary Sheet Biennial Budget FY2005-2007 Project #05-02 Page 3 of 3

Section	Strengths	Weaknesses
	- Recognizes the difficulties in customizing COTS software.	maintained by HHS. Duplication of functions and data would create another risk of keeping information in both systems synchronized and accurate. There is also a risk that the new system may not support the many interfaces that now exist between JUSTICE and systems in other agencies. - The supreme court has announced support for a juvenile court system modeled after drug courts. The project request contemplates the acquisition of a computing system, yet neither the CIP report nor the project request addresses how the system would be used to support the proposed new juvenile court system. Presumably, the new juvenile court structure would place more emphasis on intervention, treatment, and family services. This would imply that courts would work closely with the service provider, perhaps in a role other than adjudication. A new technology system should be developed to support the new court structure once it is defined.
VIII: Financial Analysis and Budget	- Services delivered to juveniles is currently a high priority to the state, and the juvenile courts are an intregal part of these services. This project has the potential to improve judicial oversight of those services. Rather than simply purchase software, an alternative project would be for the courts to work directly with HHSS to clearly define the role of the juvenile court when modeled after a drug court and its relationship to HHSS as the primary service provider. Further, the court could assist with the state's compliance with ASFA by partnering with HHSS to to define how the courts could assist with the implementation of SACWIS requirements, including data exchange, document creation, storage and retrieval, case tracking and compliance, and notifications of pending court actions. Further, the project should include court interfaces to HHSS case tracking, case management, Indian child welfare, and intervention plans for use by the court in reviewing compliance. The supreme court has expressed a need to reexamine its role in the juvenile justice system, perhaps beyond adjudication. A technology request should identify requirements to meet this new vision. There is a need to strengthen the existing juvenile court system. This project appears to transfer the burden of ASFA compliance from the agency designated with that responsibility to the	- What is the basis for the \$750,000 estimate for a new system. Does this amount include costs for configuration or modifications to meet Nebraska's requirements? Does it include the cost of data conversion or interfaces? - The budget request is composed of two major components, personnel and technology. The request is for the purchase of software licenses and support systems. The cost of integrating this juvenile system with the court's case management system is not addressed, even though these concerns are raised in the project narrative. - No breakdowns. Unclear if staff will develop specs, write RFP, train, implement, etc. Probably unable to make acquisition in one year. No justification or source for cost estimates (acquisition or ongoing or staff) and unknowns (hardware, rollout,etc).